

**Section III:**

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121 to the  
DRAWINGS**

No amendments or changes to the Drawings are proposed.

**Section IV:**  
**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121**  
**REMARKS**

Applicants propose the amendments shown herein with the intent to advance prosecution to allowance in the next office action. Applicants believe that the added elements, steps, and/or limitations place the claims clearly in a position for allowance over the art of record.

A telephone interview is requested with the examiner. As applicants are seeking agreement to allowability, it is requested that the telephone interview be attended by an examiner with authority to make such an agreement.

With respect to rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, the phrase "said step of . . ." was intended to refer to the first element in the Markush group of Claim 3. The Markush group was termed in Claim 3 as a list of "user actions", so the proposed amendment would clarify this as follows "said user action [[step]] of . . .". With this change, Applicants believe clear antecedent basis is formed. Applicants respectfully suggest that this amendment would overcome the rejection under §102, second paragraph.

With respect to rejections of Claims 11 - 15 under 35 U.S.C. §101 for being entirely directed to software, Applicants respectfully direct the examiner's attention to paragraph 0068 in which applicants disclosed alternate embodiments partially or completely committed to hardware (e.g. programmable logic, firmware-programmed processors, application specific integrated circuits, etc.). Consistent with this use of the term "system", applicants propose amending claim 11 to include clarification that a system has "one or more circuits, one or more programs executed by a processor, or a combination of circuits and processor-executed programs". Further, as discussed in the following paragraphs, the present invention operates on a system transfer buffer or "paste buffer", which is a memory construct stored in physical memory, thus the invention provides a physical transformation of matter (e.g. charging and discharging of circuit memory cells, magnetizing of magnetic media to one magnetic polarity or another, etc.). To clarify this aspect of the invention, applicants propose amending claim 11 to recite "a transfer buffer disposed in computer memory other than a file in a file system" and to amend the subsequent operations to specifically recite the transfer buffer. Applicants respectfully suggest

that this amendment would overcome the rejections under §101.

With respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) of claims 1, 5 - 6, 10 - 11, and 15, over Stern, Applicants believe the proposed amendment to the claims would clearly distinguish over the cited references in the following ways:

(1) Destination-first, source-second copying. Applicants' verbatim quoting (e.g. direct copying) sequence is the reverse of the traditional copying sequence. Normally, a user finds or locates the item to be copied, selects it, operates a copy command, and then selects a location where that copy should be placed. This is a "source-first, destination-second" sequence. Sterns "drag and drop" is such a source-first, destination-second process, where the user first selects an item to copy (e.g. clicks on the icon of the folder or file), and second drags item to the destination (e.g. on top of the destination icon), and executes the copy command by releasing the mouse button (e.g. "dropping" the dragged item).

Applicants' method, however, uses the reverse of this typical copying process, wherein the *destination* is designated first, then the *source* for copying is designated second. Thus, it is a destination-first, source-second process.

This reverse of the normal copying process, which is not suggested by the cited Stern reference, but is useful in solving the problems to which the invention is partially directed (e.g. copying the same source to multiple destinations in a single user-operation and concatenating multiple source selections into one paste transfer). Neither of the secondary references, Tomm or Tsuji, teach or suggest a destination-first, source-second copying process, either.

(2) Use of single transfer buffer to concatenate multiple copied items. Still further, however, applicants also believe that the proposed amendment will distinguish over Stern because Stern appears to teach away from operation on a paste buffer, instead favoring multiple files stored in a file system as their intermediate form of storing the copied items

in transit (*see col. 10 lines 35 - 59*). This is particularly relevant because Stern says they take this approach distinctly to allow copying of multiple items, which according to Stern is not possible with most clipboard buffers which hold a single item. However, applicants' invention's process allows concatenation of multiple items into the clipboard buffer (e.g. our "transfer buffer"), solving this problem in a manner which is not suggested or taught by Stern, Tomm or Tsuji.

As such, applicants respectfully suggest that the proposed amendment would render these claims allowable over Stern under §102(c).

With respect to the rejections of Claims 2 - 4, 7 - 9, and 12 - 14, Tomm and Tsuji are relied upon for their teachings regarding rule creation, deletion, and management. Neither Tomm nor Tsuji are directed towards destination-first, source-second processes of copying information from one computer resource to another, and neither are directed towards concatenating multiple selected information items into a single transfer or clipboard buffer.

Applicants respectfully suggest that the proposed amendment would render these claims allowable over Stern in view of Tomm in further view of Tsuji under §103(a).

#### **Request for Telephone Interview**

Applicants request a telephone interview with the examiner following receipt of the present reply and amendment in order to consider alternative terminology or phraseology which the examiner may suggest, and in order to seek agreement regarding allowability of the claims if amended as proposed.

Applicants request an interview appointment on Tuesday, May 10, 2007, at 10:00 a.m. (Eastern). Applicants' agent, Robert H. Frantz, can be reached at 405-812-5613, by the examiner to confirm this appointment, or to indicate the examiner's alternate choice of time and date for the telephone interview.